

# Evang.-Luth. Schulblatt.

54. Jahrgang.

März 1919.

Nr. 3.

## Vom viererlei Ufer.

(Auf Beschluß der Gemischten Konferenz von Chicago Heights und Umgegend  
eingesandt von W. J. F. Krägel.)

Ihr lieben Kinder! Heute haben wir eine recht ernste Geschichte vor uns. Als unser Heiland noch auf Erden wandelte und selber Gottes Wort predigte, kamen ja viele Leute zu ihm, wie wir schon öfters gehört haben. Aber nicht alle kamen mit wahrem Verlangen nach der Lehre, die selig macht. Viele kamen nur aus Zeitvertreib; manche, weil Jesus ein solch gewaltiger Prediger war, den sie gerne reden hörten; etliche auch gar, um ihm aufzulauern und etwas gegen ihn zu finden, wie wir in der letzten Geschichte, von dem Manne mit der verdorrten Hand, gesehen haben. Aus der heutigen Geschichte wollen wir nun hören, was Jesus den Leuten in seiner Umgebung und auch uns in bezug auf das Hören des Wortes Gottes zu sagen hat. Ich werde euch jetzt erzählen, bei welcher Gelegenheit dies geschah, und was Jesus gesagt hat. (Erzählen bis zum Ende des Gleichnisses.)

Wovon handelt diese Geschichte? Vom viererlei Ufer.

Wohin ging Jesus? Er ging aus dem Hause und setzte sich an das Meer.

Wer versammelte sich da zu ihm? Es versammelte sich viel Volks zu ihm.

Warum wohl? Sie wollten ihn hören und Wunder sehen.

Wohin trat Jesus, als das Volk zu sehr drängte? Er trat in ein Schiff.

Wo stand das Volk? Das Volk stand am Ufer.

Was redete er nun zu ihnen? Er redete zu ihnen mancherlei.

Wodurch redete er zu ihnen? Durch Gleichnisse.

Das will ich euch erklären. Unser Pastor erzählt während der Predigt öfters eine kleine Geschichte, wodurch er etwas in der Predigt den Leuten klar machen will, daß sie es verstehen. So machte

Jesus es auch oft. Dies ist das erste Mal, daß wir eine derartige Geschichte in unserm Buche antreffen. Solche kommen aber noch öfter, darum merkt jezt, was ich euch sage: „Ein Gleichnis ist eine kleine Geschichte von irdischen Dingen mit himmlischer Bedeutung.“

Wiederhole mir, was ich gesagt habe! Ein Gleichnis ist eine kleine Geschichte von irdischen Dingen mit himmlischer Bedeutung.

Von wem redet Jesus zu Anfang des Gleichnisses? Von einem Säemann.

Was ist denn wohl ein Säemann? Ein Farmer.

Was säte dieser Mann? Er säte seinen Samen.

Was hoffte er dabei? Er hoffte, der Same sollte aufgehen und Frucht bringen.

Wohin fiel aber ein Teil des Samens? „Etliches fiel an den Weg.“

Was geschah damit? Es ward vertreten, und die Vögel unter dem Himmel fraßen es auf.

Wohin fiel ein zweiter Teil? „Etliches fiel auf den Fels.“

Womit war der Felsen dünn bedeckt? Er war dünn mit Erde bedeckt.

Was tat dieser Same darum auch zuerst? Er ging auf.

Was geschah aber danach? Er verdorrte, darum daß er nicht Saft hatte.

Wohin konnten die feinen Wurzeln nicht dringen? Sie konnten nicht in die Erde dringen.

Wohin fiel ein dritter Teil des Samens? „Etliches fiel mitten unter die Dornen.“

Was sind Dornen? Dornen sind Unkraut.

Was tat auch dieser Same zuerst? Er ging auf.

Was ging aber mit auf? Die Dornen gingen mit auf.

Welches von beiden wuchs dann schneller? Die Dornen wuchsen schneller.

Was war dann das Ende des guten Samens? Er erstickte.

Was hat der Mann von diesen drei Teilen des Samens nicht bekommen? Er hat keine Frucht bekommen.

Wohin fiel aber nun ein vierter Teil des Samens? „Etliches fiel auf ein gut Land.“

Was war hier der Erfolg? Es ging auf und trug hundertfältige Frucht.

Wieviel Bushel hat da der Mann von einem wiedergewonnen? Von einem Bushel gewann er hundert.

Welches warnende Wort rief der Heiland den Leuten zu, als er das Gleichnis vollendet hatte? „Wer Ohren hat zu hören, der höre!“

Was meinte er wohl damit? Sie sollten nachdenken über das, was er gesagt hatte.

---

Dies war das Gleichnis. Hören wir nun die Deutung des Gleichnisses aus Jesu Munde. In unserer Geschichte wird uns weiter erzählt: „Und da er allein war“ (usw. bis zu Ende).

Wer hatte dies Gleichnis nicht verstanden? Jesu Jünger hatten es nicht verstanden.

Was fragten sie den Herrn, als er allein war? Sie fragten ihn, was dieses Gleichnis wäre.

Was sagte er ihnen dann? Er sagte ihnen die Deutung.

Welches ist der Same, von dem er redete? „Der Same ist das Wort Gottes.“

Wer ist denn wohl der Säemann? Das ist Jesus selber.

Was bedeutet dann: „Der Säemann säet das Wort“? Jesus predigt Gottes Wort.

Durch wen tut er das auch jetzt noch? Durch die Prediger.

Wem wird das Wort Gottes gepredigt? Es wird den Leuten gepredigt.

Wohin soll nun das Wort bringen? Es soll ins Herz bringen.

Was soll es bringen, ebenso wie der Same? Es soll Frucht bringen.

Was sollen die Zuhörer tun? Sie sollen es annehmen und glauben.

---

Der Glaube ist also die Frucht des Wortes. Nun geht es aber mit Gottes Wort bei den Zuhörern auch oft ähnlich wie mit dem Samen, den der Säemann ausstreute.

Was geschah doch mit einem Teil des Samens? „Etliches fiel an den Weg und ward vertreten, und die Vögel unter dem Himmel fraßen's auf.“

Wie deutet Christus dies? „Die aber an dem Wege sind, das sind, die es hören; danach kommt der Teufel und nimmt das Wort von ihrem Herzen, auf daß sie nicht glauben und selig werden.“

Was hören diese Leute wohl? Sie hören das Wort.

Wer nimmt es ihnen dann aber weg? Der Teufel nimmt es ihnen weg.

Wohin dringt es überhaupt nicht bei ihnen? Es dringt nicht ins Herz.

Was tun sie daher auch nicht? Sie nehmen es nicht an und glauben nicht.

Wie können solche nicht werden? Sie können nicht selig werden.

Bei solchen geht die Predigt, wie man sagt, zu einem Ohr hinein und zum andern wieder hinaus. Während der Predigt denken sie an ganz andere Dinge als an Gottes Wort; oder wenn sie es vielleicht wirklich hören, so kehren sie sich doch nicht daran.

Nenne mir Leute aus früherer Geschichte, an denen wir dies sehen konnten! Die Pharisäer, Schriftgelehrten und die Sadduzäer.

O Kinder, wie furchtbar ist dies Wort des Heilandes: „Der Teufel nimmt das Wort von ihren Herzen!“ Merkt darum in der Kirche wohl auf, hört zu und nehmt von Herzen an, was der liebe Heiland durch des Pastors Mund euch da sagt!

---

Was sagte Jesus im Gleichnis dann von dem zweiten Teil des Samens? „Etliches fiel auf den Fels; und da es aufging, verdorrte es, darum daß es nicht Saft hatte.“

Mit welchen Worten erklärt er dies? „Die aber auf dem Fels, sind die: wenn sie es hören, nehmen sie das Wort mit Freuden an; aber sie haben nicht Wurzel; eine Zeitlang glauben sie, und zu der Zeit der Anfechtung, wenn sich Trübsal und Verfolgung um des Worts willen erhebt, fallen sie ab.“

Was tun also solche zuerst, wenn sie das Wort hören? Sie nehmen es mit Freuden an.

Was wirkt das Wort in ihnen? Es wirkt den Glauben in ihnen.

Was hat dieser Glaube aber nicht? Er hat nicht Wurzel.

Wie lange glauben sie nur? Nur eine Zeitlang glauben sie.

Wann verlieren sie den Glauben wieder? Zu der Zeit der Anfechtung, wenn sich Trübsal und Verfolgung um des Worts willen erhebt.

Was unter Anfechtung zu verstehen ist, werdet ihr am besten erkennen, wenn wir Beispiele nennen.

Nenne mir jemand eine Anfechtung, da Christen Trübsal und Verfolgung leiden! Wenn es ihnen im Leben übel geht. — Wenn die Gottlosen über sie lachen. — Wenn sie Verfolgung leiden müssen und um des Worts willen in Lebensgefahr kommen.

Ja, Kinder, derer sind es nicht wenige, denen es so geht. In guten Tagen glauben sie; kommen aber böse Tage, dann ist es vorbei mit ihrem Glauben.

Wodurch sollen wir uns nicht vom Glauben abbringen lassen? Durch Not und Trübsal.

Ja, dann ganz besonders wollen wir uns fest im Glauben an Gott halten, der allein uns zu helfen vermag.

Was war dann das Schicksal eines dritten Teils des Samens? „Etlliches fiel mitten unter die Dornen; und die Dornen gingen mit auf und erstickten's.“

Wie erklärt der Heiland diesen Teil des Gleichnisses? „Das aber unter die Dornen fiel, sind die, so es hören und gehen hin unter den Sorgen, Reichtum und Wollust dieses Lebens und ersticken das Wort und bringen keine Frucht.“

Das sind ernste Worte, die wir genau ansehen und merken wollen. Was tun auch diese Leute? Sie hören das Wort.

Was tun sie auch zuerst? Sie nehmen es an.

Dann kommen aber die Dornen. Welches sind diese Dornen? Sorgen, Reichtum und Wollust dieses Lebens.

Was für Sorgen sind denn hier gemeint? Irdische Sorgen.

Um was sorgen solche Hörer des Wortes zum Beispiel? Was sie essen und trinken und was sie anziehen sollen, und wie es ihnen in Zukunft ergehen wird.

Wie wollen viele auch gerne werden? Sie wollen gerne reich werden.

Was hängen sie dann an den Reichtum? Sie hängen ihr Herz daran.

Was vergessen solche bei ihrem Sorgen und über ihrem Reichtum? Sie vergessen Gottes Wort.

Aber noch ein Drittes nennt der Herr, eine Gefahr, die früher als Sorgen und Reichtum auch an euch herantreten wird, wenn ihr größer werdet. Welches ist diese Versuchung? Es ist die Wollust.

Das will ich euch erklären. Damit ist gemeint Fressen und Saufen, Tanz, Theater usw. Vormittags zur Kirche, am Nachmittag oder Abend auf den Tanzboden oder zur "show" gehen. An solchen Plätzen, ihr lieben Kinder, steht der Glaube in großer Gefahr; ja, wer da hingeht, wird seinen Glauben schnell verlieren. O, gebe der liebe Gott euch Gnade, von solchen Orten fernzubleiben, damit nicht von einem unter euch später gesagt werden müsse: Er oder sie war einmal ein gläubiger Christ, aber der Tanzboden und das Theater waren sein oder ihr Verderben! Darum bleibt weg von solchen Plätzen, die sind nicht für wahre Christen; da ist Jesus auch nicht mit seiner Gnade.

Nun aber zum vierten Teil des Samens, dem wir — helfe Gott! — ähnlich sein wollen.

Was sagt der Heiland davon? „Etlliches fiel auf ein gut Land, und es ging auf und trug hundertfältige Frucht.“

Wie deutet Christus dies? „Das aber auf dem guten Lande, sind, die das Wort hören und behalten in einem feinen, guten Herzen und bringen Frucht in Geduld.“

Wohin dringt bei diesen Hörern das Wort? Es dringt in ihr Herz.

Was wirkt es da? Es wirkt den Glauben.

Was ist aber der Unterschied zwischen dieser vierten und der zweiten und dritten Klasse von Hörern, die auch erst zum Glauben kamen? Der Glaube dieser Hörer bleibt fest im Herzen und bringt Frucht.

Wodurch zeigt sich dieser Glaube? Durch gute Werke.

Wodurch lassen diese Leute sich nicht vom Glauben abbringen? Durch Not und Trübsal.

Wodurch auch nicht? Durch Sorgen, Reichtum und Wollust.

Seht, das ist die herrliche Frucht des Wortes Gottes! Es wirkt den Glauben, der Glaube bleibt fest und zeigt sich durch gute Werke.

Was sagt Jesus von solchen Gläubigen im Spruch unter der Geschichte? „Selig sind, die das Wort Gottes hören und bewahren.“

Was müssen wir hören, um selig zu werden? Wir müssen Gottes Wort hören.

Was ist aber noch wichtiger als das Hören? Daß wir das Gehörte bewahren.

Was ist damit gemeint? Wir müssen das Wort glauben und im Glauben behalten.

Was habt ihr nun aus diesem Gleichnis gelernt? 1. Wir sollen Gottes Wort hören. — 2. Wenn wir es hören, sollen wir es annehmen und glauben. — 3. Wir sollen uns durch nichts vom Glauben abbringen lassen. — 4. Wir müssen im Glauben bleiben bis ans Ende.

Das ist nun doch leicht getan, nicht wahr? Nein, es ist nicht leicht.

Warum denn nicht? Der Teufel und die Welt sind uns zu stark.

Wie willst du es dann aber fertig bringen? Wir müssen Gott bitten, daß er uns seine Gnade dazu verleihe.

Das will er auch tun. Laßt uns daher jetzt beten:

Ach hilf, Herr, daß wir werden gleich  
 Auch hier dem guten Lande  
 Und sei'n an guten Werken reich  
 In unserm Amt und Stande,  
 Viel Früchte bringen in Geduld,  
 Bewahren deine Lehr' und Guld  
 In feinem, gutem Herzen.

Amen.

## Diacritical Marks.

---

In nearly all Readers the various lessons usually have the difficult words placed at the head with the diacritical marks and the marks of accent shown. In our Concordia Publishing House series of Readers the diacritical marks are already given in the Second Reader.

It is evident that the diacritical marks are given for some particular purpose, and it seems, too, that this particular purpose is to assist the children to learn to pronounce the words correctly, and thus to aid them to read fluently. — If this is the reason for giving the words with diacritical marks, and we assume that it is, and if we further assume that thorough instruction and repeated drills will really be of aid to the child, it ought to be the aim of every teacher to familiarize the pupils with the marks and the various values given to them.

The significance of the diacritical marks should be taught early, at least as soon as the child is able to understand their use and purpose.

It is not necessary to teach all the diacritical marks at once. The most common, the breve and the macron, should be studied first, and so thoroughly drilled that the children may see at a glance whether a short or a long vowel sound is indicated.

In the Second Reader, in the first Lesson, "God Cares for Us," the following words, with the breve or the macron shown, are given at the head of the lesson: —

Göd,    thîngs,    fōöd,    clōthing,    bēasts,    grāin,    plānt,  
           ōnly,    knōws,    kîndness,    blēss.

It is evident that some of the children can pronounce some of these words correctly without knowing the markings. They will probably know that it is "Göd," and "thîngs," and "fōöd." However, "clōthing" and "bēasts" may not be quite so familiar to them, and some of the children might pronounce these words "clōthing" and "bēasts."

In some schools the teachers prepare for the next lesson by pronouncing the difficult words and by having the children repeat the pronunciation. If this is done several times, the children may be able to remember the correct sound until the next day, and thus this method may be of assistance in securing the correct pronunciation.

However, this method has two very serious defects: first, it destroys independent work on the part of the child, and secondly, it wastes valuable time. If the children already know the correct pronunciation of a word, it is useless to pronounce this word for



them. It is of much greater importance to develop independent work on the part of the child. The child is always more than willing to have the teacher do its work, and often will look for assistance as long as the teacher will supply it. It may thus require the teacher's time, patience, and help for a much longer time than necessary. It is far better for the child to have the teacher train it to do its own work, and thus to cultivate a spirit of independence in the child. This may require some time in the beginning, but after the child has learned how to do the work, the time apparently lost in the beginning in teaching the child will be more than recovered by the time saved later. The teacher should at all times be willing to direct and assist the child wherever necessary, but at no time ought he to do for the child what it can do for itself.

From the foregoing we may deduce the fact that if the child itself can learn to pronounce the words at the head of the reading-lesson, it is a positive waste of time and a real injury to independent work on the part of the child if the teacher does the work of pronunciation for the class before giving the children an opportunity to exercise independence in their work.

Children attend school to be taught, and if the teacher expects the children to do independent work, he must teach them how to do it. In the teaching of pronunciation one of the first requisites is that the children recognize the significance of the diacritical marks and the value of accent. Equipped with this knowledge and a dictionary, they will find few words in the English language that will offer much difficulty in pronunciation. In fact, we teachers are equipped with no greater means of information when meeting with strange words. We apply this knowledge, and learn to pronounce.

It is not very difficult to teach the significance of the diacritical marks, especially of the breve and the macron. If lists of familiar short words are selected and written on the blackboard with the proper diacritical markings, and the children are shown the effect of the breve and the macron upon the sound of the vowel, it will not be very long before the children learn the correct sounds. To illustrate: Write columns similar to the following:—

hăt	hâte	măt	mâte	făt	fâte	răt	râte
pět	Pête	hěr	hêre	bīt	bîte	kīt	kîte
nőt	nôte	röd	röde	cūr	cüre	pūr	püre

etc.

Show the children that in each case the breve shortens the sound of the vowel, and that the macron lengthens it. When they are thoroughly familiar with the significance of the marks, arrange columns of words in promiscuous order, and drill the class in pronunciation, thus:—



běd	bōde	lōt	būt	sīt	căt	cōt	blōt
hăve	sīng	cōme	lōne	thēn	măt	sīn	sūn
lēd	nōw	thānk	Gōd	plānt	kīnd	shōne	nōt
sēll	bāde	tāke	sōw	sōw	shūt	whīne	sōme
will	rīch	rīce	dāy	māy	tōt	cēde	mēte
etc.							

Finally the words at the head of the reading-lesson may be taken for drill upon the breve and the macron, and when the teacher is convinced that the children understand and can give the correct value of these, some of the other more simple diacritical marks and the accent marks may be studied.

If this work is persistently carried on for a time, the children will be equipped to do independent work in learning the pronunciation of words, and later will readily use the dictionary in their work. At the same time the teacher saves time and effort, and there will be few cases in which the teacher will be called upon for assistance in this particular phase of the work of reading. Try it! M.

### Cultivating Manners in the Schoolroom.

It is the duty of the school to teach good manners, because it is the duty of the school to prepare the children for the future. A man or woman seriously lacking in the ordinary good conduct will not be influential in his or her profession nor a leader in business. Sometimes we see a young college graduate leaving his institution of learning with great honors, respected by his professors, esteemed by his friends because of his unusual ability. Several years afterwards we meet the same young man a total failure in business. What has caused his downfall? His mental ability could not be surpassed. His efficiency in his professional knowledge was far beyond the average. What was lacking? He was awkward; he was without tact; he was embarrassed in the presence of people due to his lack of self-control—he was not prepared for life and its great social problems. Neither the home, nor the school, nor the college had imparted to him the necessary knowledge in good conduct.

It is maintained by some educators that the proper place to cultivate good conduct is the home. But the influence of the home has its limitations as compared with the school. The teacher is evidently more interested in, and more familiar with, the methods of producing results upon the immature mind of the children than the parents. And children are more apt to accept the teaching

and advice in this direction when they are with a group of children than when they are alone; and what is done in the presence of a class has greater effect, as a rule, upon the child than when it is done in the comparative solitude of the home. In reference to this Von Humboldt's words are of great importance: "What you wish to see appear in the life of a nation must be first introduced into the schools."

How must good manners be taught in school? Undoubtedly, the most important single force at the disposal of the teacher for the inculcation of good manners is the good conduct of the teacher himself, because he will be imitated. The teacher's bearing, his conduct, his manners, his intuitive appreciation of what is fit, proper, or right, in other words, his tact in the presence of pupils, should be above reproach; and if he is not conversant with the accepted code of manners, it is his duty to become so, and to conform his manners to the same. It is without avail, for instance, to censure children for carelessness in posture if the teacher himself assumes an improper attitude in the schoolroom. The teacher must furnish the model in actions, motions, attitude, cleanliness, tidiness, and all prevailing good manners, otherwise he is a failure as an educator. If the teacher does not exemplify the importance of cleanliness and tidiness in his own person and dress, strictly adhering to such habits, the result will be that his schoolchildren will follow his example relative to his habits. If he does not guard his facial expressions, but continually has a stolid look, or wears a constant, conventional smile, both of which are objectionable, his pupils will form similar habits. If he does not guard his words, but is continually and with a frowning countenance nagging and scolding, using improper or even violent speech due to a lack of self-control, he will demoralize his pupils; for they will consider the customary improprieties of speech on the part of the teacher as necessary expressions of a forceful character. Emerson says: "Loudness is rude, quietness always gentle." If even the loud, rude voice of the teacher unconsciously exerts an unrefining influence upon the children, who are very close imitators, then impropriety in speech, nagging and scolding work still greater harm.

Experience, however, has shown that the informal or unconscious teaching of manners by a model deportment of the teacher will not suffice to attain the desired object. In addition, other methods must be employed. It is necessary to teach the various requirements of an accepted code, thereby referring to actual occurrences or examples that present themselves at any time in school-

life. Courtesy must be practised in school, and every direction given regarding good manners should, if possible, be exemplified in the schoolroom.

The objection has been raised that polished manners are nothing but an outward show, glittering gloss covering a hypocritical heart. This, however, need not be. Although it must be admitted that "Europens uebertuenechte Hoeflichkeit" is despicable, yet it cannot be denied that the foundation of true courtesy is always a kind heart and loving kindness to one's fellow-men. True politeness, born of genuine love, consists in making every one happy as far as is consistent with the Word of God. It actually is nothing less than forgetfulness of one's self and thoughtfulness of the comfort of others. Scriptures teach us the principles of good conduct in life. It tells us that the source of good conduct is true kindness and unselfishness, that true kindness of the heart and unselfishness and self-denial is a fruit of faith which is created in our hearts through the Holy Ghost. The Bible demands good Christian conduct, Gal. 5, 22; to love one another, John 15, 12; to abstain from all appearance of evil, 1 Thess. 5, 22; to control ("keep under") the body, 1 Cor. 9, 27; to subdue the temper, Eph. 4, 26; to live peaceably with all men, Rom. 12, 18; to sympathize with others, Gal. 6, 2, etc., etc.; and if it is the demand of the Bible, it is surely the duty of a teacher in a Christian day-school to instil into the minds of his pupils true Christian manners and virtues, as well as such manners of the world about us as are not in disagreement with true Christianity. W. C. K.

---

## William Makepeace Thackeray.

### 1. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

William Makepeace Thackeray, one of England's greatest authors and novelists, was a descendant of a good old English family of high standing. His grandfather, Wm. R. Thackeray, was an eminent scholar; his father, Richmond, a university graduate, held a responsible position in the Civil Service of the East India Company. He was, therefore, obliged to spend much of his time at Calcutta, the capital of the British possessions in India. Here it was, in the year 1811, that William Makepeace was born. His mother, who was barely nineteen years old at the time, was left a widow in 1816, but shortly after married Major Henry Smyth of the British army. This second marriage of his mother

may account for his being sent to England at the tender age of seven, and placed in the old Charterhouse boarding-school, near Smithfield, that ancient and renowned pile which Thackeray loved so well to commemorate in his writings. Here it was that this celebrated author received his elementary education and training.

In the annals of the school he is described as "a pretty, gentle, and timid boy." Traces of this nature, with an acute sensitiveness, which often belongs to the creative mind, and which is so often mistaken for irritability, bitterness, and cynicism, may readily be traced by the careful reader, especially in his earlier writings.

In February, 1829, when but eighteen years old, Thackeray entered Trinity College, that old renowned university at Cambridge, but left it again the following year without taking a degree. In 1831 he went to Germany, where he made the acquaintance of Goethe, at Weimar. His ambition was to become a celebrated artist.

In 1832, on becoming of age, he took possession of a fortune left him by his father, which amounted to £20,000. He now traveled over the greater part of Europe, and finally studied drawing and painting under the best masters of the art in Paris and in Rome.

His paintings, critics tell us, were picturesque and truthful, and not without merit, but rather quaint, lacking the bright touches of a masterhand. Thackeray was fortunate in discovering this himself before he grew too old, and before his financial resources became exhausted, and he decided to direct his energies into a different channel. He chose literature, the study of which he began, with rare patience and contentment, at the bottom of the ladder.

His first contributions were made to minor journals and magazines, and only after many bitter disappointments and hard, incessant labor did he succeed in placing them with magazines of a higher standing. Even then he was too timid to use his own name as an author, but published his writings under the characteristic names of Michael Angelo Titmarsh, Fitz-Boodle, and Ikey Solomons, Jr. Having finally established a reputation as a writer of note by one of his best minor novels, *The Great Hoggarty Diamond*, published in the *Frazer Magazine* under the pseudonym Titmarsh, he settled down in life, and married Isabella, the daughter of Colonel Matthew Shawe, who after the birth of her second daughter became seriously ill, lost her mind, and died shortly after. Thackeray remained a widower the rest of his life.

He continued his regular contributions to the *Frazer Magazine*

until 1843, when he began writing for *Punch* for a series of ten years. The years 1846 to 1848 brought the author's most popular novel, *Vanity Fair*. It was published in twenty-four parts by Bradbury and Evans, and at once placed the author in the highest rank as a novelist and writer.

A series of lectures on the humorists of the eighteenth century were written and delivered toward the close of the year 1848. They proved to be quite a success, and were delivered a second time by the author on his tour in America in 1852 and 1853.

In 1857 Thackeray went into politics, and became a candidate for the British Parliament, but was defeated. In 1859 he became editor of the *Cornhill Magazine*; this, however, proved a task which the kindliness and sensitiveness of his disposition made irksome to him, and he resigned in April, 1862. Numerous works followed, of which *Henry Esmond*, *The Newcomes*, and *Denis Duval* are considered the best. This last novel, which promised to be the author's very best, was published in the *Cornhill Magazine*, but was never finished.

To the grief of all lovers of genius, of manly and noble character, Thackeray was suddenly cut off in the fulness of his powers, in his fifty-second year, dying alone and unseen in his room shortly before daybreak on the morning of the 24th of December, 1863. The doctors found that death was caused by effusion of the brain, and that his brain was one of the largest ever recorded to medical science, weighing 58½ ounces. Thackeray was buried in Kensal Green, and a bust by Marochetti was placed to his memory in Westminster Abbey.

## 2. THACKERAY'S WORKS.

As has been mentioned in the first part of this sketch, Thackeray's first literary success was *The Great Hoggarty Diamond*, published in 1837. It certainly is one of his best minor writings, with splendid instances of wit, humor, satire, and pathos. The characters (from Lady Drum, Lady Fanny, etc., down to Mrs. Roundhead and Sam Titmarsh's pious aunt) are living, and the book is full of honest fun, keeping alive the interest of the reader to the last chapter. Oddly enough, the work met with the fate that befell other good stories—it had to be cut short at the bidding of the editor.

The year 1840 brought forth *The Paris Sketch-book* in two volumes. *The Second Funeral of Napoleon* and *The Chronicle of the Drum* were published in 1841; and *The Irish Sketch-book*

in 1843. Other shorter and minor writings appeared between 1837 and 1843, of which a story, called *Catherine*, probably is the best known. It appeared in *Frazer's Magazine* under the pseudonym Ikey Solomons, Jr., in 1839 and '40. This story was written for the purpose of counteracting the injurious influence of the most popular fiction of the time, which made heroes of highwaymen and burglars, and created a false sympathy for the vicious and criminal. With this purpose in view Thackeray chose a woman, named Catherine Hayes, for his subject, who had been burned to death at Tyburn in 1726 for the deliberate murder of her husband under exceedingly revolting circumstances. Thackeray's aim was to describe the career of this wretched woman and her associates with such fidelity to truth as to exhibit the danger and folly of investing such persons with heroic and romantic qualities. It is a strong story, and, as some critics have it, almost too disagreeable for its purpose.

Much of the *Paris Sketch-book* had been written previous to the year 1837, as may readily be detected by every careful reader. *Fitz-Boodle's Confessions and Professions*, including the series *Men's Wives*, followed, and the *Shabby Genteel Story*, an unfinished production, was next. This was interrupted by Thackeray's domestic afflictions, and never finished, but used as an introduction to a later book, called the *Adventures of Philip*. From 1843 to 1853 the following works appeared in *Punch*: The celebrated *Snob Papers*, the *Ballads of Policeman X*, the *Irish Sketch-book*, an account of his journey from Cornhill to Grand Cairo, a journey forced upon the author on account of ill health, while working incessantly at his *Vanity Fair*. In the description of this journey we find that most excellent poem, *The White Squall*.

In 1844 *Frazer's Magazine* began to publish *Barry Lyndon*, another of the author's best minor stories. As this story caused quite a sensation, stirring up critics *pro* and *con*, a few remarks pertaining to the general trend of the story may seem proper. The hero of the story, Barry, as a boy, displays some fine touches of a wild chivalry, simplicity, and generosity, which, however, mingle with the worst qualities that, under the influence of an abominable training, corrupt his whole mind and career. The man Harry becomes so infatuated *with*, and so blind *to*, his own roguery, has so much dash and daring, is so infamously treated on occasions, that it is not easy to look upon him as an entirely detestable villain, until, toward the end of his course, he becomes wholly lost in brutish debauchery and cruelty. Many saw in this

story an attack upon the schools and educational system at large. Hence, the great interest and criticism from all sides.

Besides the regular contributions to *Punch* we must also take notice of the author's brilliant short stories which appeared in the *Punch Prize Novelist*. Of these probably *In Codlingsby* is the most perfect. Other admirable writings are: *A Legend of the Rhine*, *Cox's Diary*, *The Fatal Book*, and *Rebecca and Rowena*. All are on the burlesque order, and regarded very good. The last mentioned is even said to be the best of its kind ever written by any author up to the present times. Its tastes, wit, humor, and pathos are considered by literary critics as unmatchable. It also contains some of the best songs of their particular kind ever published.

*Vanity Fair*, when first published, was illustrated by the author himself, or, to use his own words, "illuminated by the author's own candles." As every educated person has undoubtedly read this great piece of English fiction, it is not necessary to sketch its contents. Suffice it to say that in spite of its great popularity it is not regarded as one of the author's ablest works. Short writings of the same year are: *Mrs. Perkin's Ball*, a Christmas story, *Our Street*, *Dr. Birch and His Young Friends*.

Having now fully established his identity as an author of high rank, Thackeray, in 1849, began a second serial fiction, *Pendennis*, under his own name. In this we find recorded a great deal of the author's own history and experience. It is inferior in literary value to *Vanity Fair*, and some of the criticism seems more justified.

*Rebecca and Rowena* was published in 1850, and the *Kickleburys on the Rhine* in 1851. The latter, a satirical sketch, received much severe criticism by the London papers, but Thackeray, who was very sensitive to criticism at other times, surprised the public press with a reply by a caustic and humorous essay on *Thunder and Small Beer*, which he used as a prefix or preface to his second edition.

Thackeray's two series of lectures, one on "The Humorists of the 18th Century," the other on "The Four Georges," are light, graceful, and discriminating, with many passages full of real power and eloquence.

During the period from 1852 to 1855 appeared the two novels which are regarded as the most richly imaginative and highly finished of his works, *Henry Esmond* and *The Newcomes*. These were followed by *The Virginians*, a sequel to *Henry Esmond*, but a much inferior novel.



After the lectures on "The Four Georges," which were first delivered in our country, two short stories of somewhat coarse texture appeared, *Lovel the Widower* and *Philip*. These were followed by a series of pleasant gossiping essays, entitled *Round-about Papers*. They originally appeared in the *Cornhill Magazine*. In the same paper, shortly after, he began a new novel, *Denis Duval*, which promised to be the most carefully elaborated and successful of his works of fiction. He also contemplated writing Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Ann, which was to serve as a continuation of Macaulay's *History of England*. He was well acquainted with this period of English history through his studies and researches for Henry Esmond; but, alas! such dreams and anticipations were suddenly dispelled by his unexpected death.

### 3. CHARLES DICKENS'S OPINION OF THACKERAY AND HIS WORKS.

Commenting on Thackeray's last novel, or, rather, the fragments of the same, Dickens writes: "On the table before me there lies all that he had written of his latest and last story. That it would be sad to any one — that it is inexpressibly so to a writer — in his evidences of matured designs never to be accomplished; of intentions begun to be executed, and destined never to be completed; of careful preparations for long roads of thought that he was never to traverse, and for shining goals that he was never to reach, will readily be believed. The pain, however, that I have felt in perusing it has not been deeper than the conviction that he was in the healthiest vigor of his powers when he wrought on his last labor. In respect of earnest feeling, far-seeing purpose, character, incident, and a certain loving picturesqueness blending the whole, I believe it to be much the best of all his works. That he fully meant it to be so, that he had become strongly attached to it, and that he bestowed great pains upon it, I trace in almost every page.

"It contains one picture which must have cost him extreme distress, and which is, nevertheless, a masterpiece. There are two children in it, touched with a hand so loving and tender as ever a father caressed his little child with. There is some young love as pure and innocent and pretty as the truth.

"It is very remarkable that, by reason of the singular construction of the story, more than one main incident usually belonging to the end of such a fiction, is anticipated in the beginning, and thus there is an approach to completeness in the fragment, as to the satisfaction of the reader's mind concerning the most

interesting persons, which could hardly have been better attained if the writer's breaking off had been foreseen.

"The last line he wrote, and the last proof he corrected, are among these papers through which I have so sorrowfully made my way. The condition of the little pages of manuscript where death stopped his hand shows that he carried them about, taking them out of his pocket, here and there, for patient revision and interlineation. The last words corrected by him in print were, 'And my heart throbbed with an exquisite bliss.'

"God grant that on that Christmas Eve when he laid his head back on his pillow and threw up his arms as he had been wont to do when very weary, some consciousness of duty done, and Christian hope throughout life humbly cherished, may have caused his own heart so to throb when he passed away to his Redeemer's rest!"

These are words of a near and dear friend, who knew all his troubles and sorrows as well as his great merits as an author, as a man, and as a Christian, and who undoubtedly had the ability to judge when he pronounced Thackeray the greatest living novelist and one of England's foremost writers.

#### 4. HIS CHARACTER AND VIRTUES AS AN AUTHOR.

Thackeray, in his delineation of the character and genius of Fielding, has almost drawn a true portrait of himself. He had the same hatred for all meanness, cant, and knavery; the same large sympathy, relish of life, thoughtful humor, keen insight, delicate irony, and wit. Still there is one great personal difference. Fielding was utterly careless as to censure, whereas Thackeray, tremblingly alive to criticism, was wounded to the quick by the slightest attack. His organization was morbidly delicate, and this made him exceedingly susceptible of either pain or pleasure. He had suffered much from physical maladies and from domestic calamity, which, as some critics claim, is clearly discernible, especially in his earlier writings. Still there were moments, and sometimes longer periods, when he was, apparently, not affected by them.

Most of the criticism was produced by bigoted and jealous minds. Even *Vanity Fair*, Thackeray's most popular work, was severely criticized by them; they accused the author of cynicism and of a delight in representing the baser side of human nature, in fact, of being skeptical as to the existence of real virtue in the world. Dickens, however, who knew Thackeray at least as well as any of his contemporaries, had an entirely different opinion

of the qualities of his character. He writes: "If Thackeray's satirical pen, in the reckless vivacity of his youth, has ever gone astray or done amiss, he has caused it to prefer its own petition for forgiveness long before, when he wrote:

"I've writ the foolish fancy of his brain,  
The aimless jest that, striking, has caused pain;  
The idle word that he'd wish back again."

With the keen knowledge of men Thackeray foresaw, and provided against, these attacks in the very book which is said by some critics to exhibit his faults most plainly; and the passage alluded to (at the end of the eighth chapter of *Vanity Fair*) is about the best commentary ever written on the author's method. Here he explains himself how he wishes to describe men and women as they actually are: good, bad, indifferent; and to claim the privilege, as he says, "occasionally to step down from the platform, and talk about them: if they are good and kindly, to love and shake them by the hand; if they are silly, to laugh at them confidentially in the reader's sleeve; if they are wicked and heartless, to abuse them in the strongest words of which politeness admits. Otherwise you might fancy it was I who was sneering at the practise of devotion which Miss Sharp finds so ridiculous; that it was I who laughed good-humoredly at the railing of old Sitenus, a baronet — whereas the laughter comes from one who has no reverence except for posterity, and no eyes for anything beyond success. Such people there are living and flourishing in the world — Faithless, Hopeless, Charityless. Let us have at them, dear friends, with might and main. Some there are, and very successful, too, mere quacks and fools, and it was to combat and expose such as those that laughter was raised."

Again it is Charles Dickens that gives us the most authentic information regarding Thackeray's character and virtues, both as a man and as an author. He says: "My remembrance of him is marked by many occasions when he was supremely humorous, when he was irresistibly extravagant, when he was softened and serious, when he was charming with children — but by none do I recall him more tenderly than by two or three that started out from the crowd when he unexpectedly presented himself in my room, announcing how that some passage in a certain book had made him cry yesterday, and how that he had come to dinner 'because he couldn't help it,' and must talk such passage over. No one could ever have seen him more genial, natural, cordial, fresh, and honestly impulsive than I have seen him at those times.

No one can be surer than I of the greatness and goodness of his heart that then disclosed itself."

Dickens relates an incident in which Thackeray delivered a lecture in London, in the course of which he read his very best contribution to *Punch*, describing the grown-up cares of a poor family of poor children. "No one," says Dickens, "who heard him could have doubted his natural gentleness or his thoroughly unaffected manly sympathy with the weak and lowly. He read the paper most pathetically, and with a simplicity of tenderness that certainly moved *one* of his audience to tears."

Other traits in his character were his good sense, good spirit, and humor. He had a particular delight in boys and an excellent way with them. "I remember," says Dickens, "his once asking me with fantastic gravity, after he had been to Eton, where my eldest son then was, whether I felt as he did in regard to never seeing a boy without wanting to give him a sovereign. But greater things that are known of him, in the way of warm affection, quiet endurance, unselfish thoughtfulness for others, and his open, munificent hand may be told."

Surely do these remarks on the good qualities and virtues of this noble character, coming from such a reliable source, exonerate him and protect him from the rude and unfriendly criticism of his enemies.

Another accusation brought against our author by such critics was, that he laid on the colors too thickly, in the sense that the villains were too villainous, and that the good people he described were too goody-goody. I believe that every careful student of Thackeray's works will find the correct answer to this unjust piece of criticism for himself in the description of such characters as Lady Castlewood, Henry Esmond, Col. Newcome, Laura Pendenis, etc. And Thackeray's great strength, as that of his friend Dickens, lay in that very portraying of characters rather than in inventing incidents. In the characters already mentioned, as in others, such as Becky Sharp, Harry Foker, and Paul de Koch (to say nothing of the picaroon, Barry Lyndon), he has left us a living gallery not surpassed by any modern novelist.

Before closing our remarks, we are in duty bound also to mention Thackeray's poetry. Although not a poet, and without even the pretensions of being such, the grace and spontaneity of his versification are beyond question. Some of his more serious efforts, such as *The Chronicle of the Drum* (1841), are full of power and instinct of true poetic feeling, and his translations from

Beranger are considered as good as verse translations can be. He certainly had the true poetic instinct, and proved it by writing poetry which in many instances equals his prose in grace and feeling.

In regard to his late works, even the most severe critics concede that the dark shades no longer preponderate, and that the mellowing influences of years and experience, a calmer, as well as a more extensive observation of life had changed the merciless satirist to the genial humorist and philosophic observer. He has still ample scorn for falsehood and vice, and satire for folly and pretense, but also smiles and tears and kindness and charity, which give a moral beauty to the last decade of his brilliant career. This opinion of unfriendly critics speaks volumes.

It is not necessary to discuss the precise place in the literary world which Thackeray deserves to hold, or will hold in the future; but as Dickens says: "It is absolutely certain that his refined knowledge of character, his subtle acquaintance with the weaknesses of human nature, his delightful playfulness as an essayist, his quaint and touching ballads, his mastery over the English language, enriched by the force and variety of his genius and art, will always hold for him a place as one of the greatest of English novelists and essayists, and, it should be added, as by no means the least of English critics."

A. L. WENDT.

---

### A Priceless Treasure — Our Lutheran College.

Very few Christians really appreciate what a priceless treasure we have in our Lutheran College, as they do not know the spirit that dominates many other institutions of learning. The *Christian Standard*, in a recent issue, speaks of the sad conditions obtaining in many schools, and issues an earnest warning against what it rightly calls "paganism" in American institutions of learning. It says:—

That the teaching with which Germany, for several decades prior to the war, dazzled the eyes of educators throughout the civilized world, and which, especially in America, is still a menace to education, is very largely pagan in its origin, content, and results, will be apparent to all who bestow upon it comprehensive and unbiased investigation. Nor is it at all difficult for either the professional or business man, or even the day-toiler, to investigate this charge sufficiently to be convinced that it is well founded. Any public library will furnish the evidence; moreover, this evi-

dence is abundant in the bookstores and even in current periodical literature. Therefore, one wonders that so many, otherwise informed, are so woefully ignorant of the most vital issue now before mankind, and that people in every community are ready to accept, without questioning its merits, whatever the pretender in pulpit or classroom chooses to hand out to them.

This brand of teaching is known by several names. Its advocates call it "higher criticism," which is a misnomer, and "assured scholarship," which is ridiculous. Those opposed to the "made-in-Germany" scholarship frequently refer to it as "rationalism" and "destructive criticism."

However, a new name for this system of affirmations, which seeks the destruction of all things sacred, has been recently brought forward, and we are convinced that it is the most appropriate thus far introduced. A writer — himself a man fresh from the university atmosphere — a few weeks ago concluded in the *Sunday-school Times* a series of articles, in which he declared and proved that the average American university is shot through with paganism.

As a sample of paganized teaching in institutions of learning in our own country, we shall refer to conditions in a leading State university, by quoting from a letter of recent date written by a young lady, who is now attending this institution, to the principal of the high school she attended last year:

"It seems as if everything I have been taught to believe has been uprooted since I came here. I have been told that God made man by degrees, that the Bible is not divine, that Christ is to be ranked with Alexander, etc., etc.

"It does no good to say you do not believe what is taught. I did this, and since then my section teacher has referred to me as one of those 'painfully good' people who close their eyes to science, lest they should discover that their religion is wrong! This is exactly what he said in section meeting, where twenty-five or more of us go to have our weekly 'quiz.'

"Please remember me when you pray, won't you? I do not wish to lose my faith, and I feel that God will answer your prayer."

This statement, with its heart appeal, is pathetic. Desiring to fit herself for a special service, the author of the letter felt that, of necessity, she had to take a course in the university of her State. She is now in the classrooms of this institution, where her most sacred heart-treasures are ridiculed, and where she is ridiculed by her teachers for attempting to stand fast in her faith.



In another paragraph the young lady states that one of her teachers is a Theosophist, that another is a Unitarian, and that still another is a Christian Scientist. And she might have added that there are teachers who are out-and-out atheists — such are in leading universities the country over.

This picture is not overdrawn. In evidence we offer the complaint voiced by a modern preacher in a recent issue of the *Biblical World* that specialists and thinkers are not wanted in the Church. He points to the fact that in every other field such men are in demand; "but in the pulpits of the conservative churches, in a majority of these pulpits at least, the people dread to see expert knowledge and specialism. They fear clear thinking, if it departs from the old orthodoxy, as it often must do in these days. The people do not welcome the word of even a conservative higher criticism upon the Bible, or fearless thinking in theology. Many congregations become dreadfully uneasy if they hear the prophetic word of the specialist upon modern social problems." Yet the writer has his comforts: "In the favored places of the land, in the colleges and universities, and in many of our theological schools 'Christian' [the quotation marks are ours] thought has been making wonderfully gratifying progress in recent years."

The writer pictures to us the disappointment of the young minister who, coming from one of these seminaries, expects "that the whole world is waiting to receive his wonderfully satisfying and enlightening message," only to find "that the church is waiting for no such thing."

To such disappointed young men he suggests several modes of procedure that deserve mention. "He may go into a more liberal denomination." But "this is carrying coal to Newcastle." "Or the young minister may continue to carry on unabated his liberal propaganda in his own denomination, until his spirit is broken by the persistence and the bitterness of the assaults against him." . . . "Another plan for the prophet of progress is to resort to *camouflage*, and to dispense the new ideas in a diluted manner, very diluted, until the people are liberalized in some measure in spite of themselves. This plan is not hypocrisy, but merely good strategy on the part of the knowing teacher, and very often has marked success. Jesus uses it in His matchless parables. His disciples and apostles may use it, too, if they have the ability; for did He not tell them to 'be wise as serpents and harmless as doves'?" — It will not be necessary to point out to the reader the untruthfulness and blasphemy of the last statement.



"Perhaps the best plan that the progressive minister can adopt is to direct his chief energies toward the young people's societies. Here are minds and hearts in touch with the up-to-date methods in the public schools, and therefore unafraid of life and growth in the church." But the greatest hope of this "prophet" is in the higher institutions of learning: "And happy is that minister of the progressive thought who has a good sprinkling of college students in his congregation, youths outgrowing the old theology and groping their way toward the new."

What does this mean? Simply that young people in great numbers are, according to the boast of this representative of the modern school of theology, acquiring an "education" at the cost of their soul; that the Church justly must consider colleges of the description given in the article from which we quote her most dangerous foes, whose entire influence tends to undermine the foundation upon which the Church rests.

Christian colleges — Lutheran colleges — what priceless treasures! Do we appreciate the blessing the Lord confers on us through them? Do we value them accordingly, and foster them as diligently as we should? Can Christian parents still be in doubt as to where to send their sons and daughters?

*Northwestern Lutheran.*

---

## The Master Teacher.

They who would become efficient and successful teachers in Sunday-school or parochial school should study carefully the methods of teaching employed by the Master Teacher, Jesus Christ. In this article we wish to call attention to one striking feature in His method of teaching.

Jesus always tried to find a point of contact between the people to whom He spoke, and the truth that He wished to impress upon their hearts. This is one reason why He spoke so much in parables. Basing His story on something that His listeners already knew and were interested in, He led them on to see the beautiful truth that He wished to impress upon their hearts.

In the parable of the Sower He begins by telling them about the farmer sowing his grain. This was something that all were well acquainted with, and were thoroughly interested in. This was His point of contact. From this point of contact and interest He led them on to see the nature of God's Word, and how it was

to be heard and retained if it was to bring them any blessing. In the story of the Prodigal Son the point of contact is the home-life, something well known and of interest to all, and from this point of interest He led His hearers on to understand the wonderful truth of God's love and mercy. When He desired to teach His disciples of His loving care for His own, He did not begin by telling how He loved them even to the extent of being willing to give His life for them, but He began by talking to them about two kinds of shepherds. He called their attention to the close relation which exists between a good shepherd and his sheep, and what the good shepherd will do for his sheep. This was His point of contact from which He led them on to see the close relation which exists between Him and His disciples and His care for them.

Perhaps the best example of how Jesus applied this method in teaching individuals is in His interview with the woman of Samaria. Jesus is sitting by Jacob's well. A woman approaches the well with a pitcher in her hand. Her thoughts and interests for the present moment are about getting water. Jesus saw her approaching, and His all-searching eye sees that here is a person who must be taught the truth, and perhaps she can be led away from the sinful life that she now lives. He did not begin by reading up to her the Sixth Commandment, nor by telling her that He was the Messiah. But in a kind, appealing tone He said, "Give me a drink." This was His point of contact. This opened the conversation, and on something in which she was interested. Tactfully Jesus leads the conversation in on the living water and its wonderful characteristics. She desires to know something more about this living water. Jesus has won her confidence, and so He carefully touches the sore spot in her heart. This opens her eyes to see that her teacher must be a prophet. Now it is her turn to ask questions. Soon Jesus has led up to the truth that He is anxious to impart, namely that He is the Messiah. That she had profited immensely by this one lesson from the Master Teacher was clearly manifested when she hastened back to the city and said to her neighbors: "Come, see a man who has told me all that I ever did. Can this be the Christ?"

We note, then, two characteristics in the Master Teacher's method of teaching. He first tried to find a point of contact between the listeners' experience and the lesson that He wished to teach, and then He led them on from the known to the unknown. Most teachers follow the opposite method, and would begin where

Jesus ends. They jump right into a new lesson without any thought of connection between the lesson and what the pupils already know, or where the interests of the pupils for the time being may be centered. What is, therefore, the general experience? It is so hard to get the attention and interest of the pupils. The lesson does not appeal to them. They do not seem to grasp its significance. If we changed our method of teaching and applied Christ's method, perhaps we would be able to solve many of the problems connected with our religious instruction.

In the first place, the teacher should endeavor to stand on the plane of the child's knowledge and experience, and proceed from this standpoint in teaching rather than from his own plane of experience. This necessarily means that the teacher must first find out the knowledge, thoughts, habits, and interests of his pupils. To do this, he must make it a point to come into personal touch with his pupils as soon as possible. He should inquire into what they do during the day, where they spend their evenings, what kind of books they read, and in what work their fathers are engaged. He should visit the homes of his pupils to learn to know home conditions, and what interest parents take in the religious training of their children. The children of a godless home must be taught in a way different from the children of a Christian home. The teacher who knows his pupils to this extent will know where to begin his instruction, and how to establish the point of contact between the pupils' experience and the lesson to be taught. The teacher will then begin the lesson with some familiar story or with some question of general interest. Then gradually and tactfully he ascends upward and onward to the truth to be apprehended in the lesson.

If the lesson is on the Draught of Fishes, the point of contact can quickly be established by asking, "How many of you have ever gone fishing? Did you catch many fish?" Immediately you have everybody's interest and attention, and lead on to the lesson for the day. If the lesson is about Jesus healing the sick, the point of contact can be established by asking how many in the class ever have been sick, and if a doctor was called. With interest aroused, the teacher can now proceed to speak about Jesus the great Physician of the soul.

Quite recently the writer taught a class in the Primary Department. The lesson was Solomon's Dreams. The opening question was: "How many of you children ever had a dream?" All hands were immediately raised. This led into the story about Solomon

dreaming, and how God promised to give him anything he would ask. To gain renewed interest, the following question was asked, "If a rich man promised to give you anything you would like, for what would you ask?" Many peculiar answers were given, but on the basis of these answers the instructor led in on choosing the best things, and, like Solomon, choosing the things most pleasing to God. — *Lutheran Church Herald*.

---

### Organ Music in Church Services.

---

The Protestant churches of America have, either by agreement or consent, given to the organ a very prominent place in the services. Whereas the Puritans consistently opposed the use of musical instruments in church worship, many of the present Reformed bodies have brought the organ forward into such prominence, both architecturally and liturgically, that a discussion of the place of the organ in the Lutheran service would seem by no means superfluous, especially since an increasing number of Lutheran congregations are taking up the idea, not only of giving to the organ a very conspicuous position in the church-building, but also of yielding or assigning to it the most prominent part of the service.

The broaching of this matter may seem to some a needless emphasizing of trifles. It may be conceded, of course, that the matter of organ music of every kind is an *adiaphoron*. There is no commandment of God which gives to the organ either a primary or a secondary position, or makes music either essential or subsidiary for divine worship. And yet, it is not a matter of indifference. In many Reformed churches, organ music is placed on a par with the means of grace, and more. In many service "programs" the organ music and the names of the solo singers are displayed in prominent type, while the subject of the sermon, if one be held at all, is announced with a most apologetic air, accompanied, in many cases, with the express assurance that the sermon will not occupy more than ten or, at the most, fifteen minutes. It means, in effect, that the audience should not let the few words of the pastor or speaker interfere with its enjoyment of the musical numbers on the "program." There may be no harm intended if such "special music programs" be announced for a Lutheran church in place of the regular service with preaching, but there certainly is danger of harm. A Lutheran congregation will strive to bring

out its doctrinal position also in its *cultus*, and will avoid everything that may be misconstrued as though the Lutherans had abated one whit from their position toward the means of grace. The Word and the Sacraments must always occupy the most prominent place before the congregation, and everything that will detract the attention of the audience from these most important parts of the service must be avoided with the greatest care.

In order, however, that this principle may be upheld in the Lutheran Church, it is necessary that the organist (and the music committee) be acquainted with the liturgical history of the Christian Church, especially since the sixteenth century. It may not be necessary to take a full and thorough course in liturgics, though such a course would by no means seem superfluous, but it would certainly be advisable to take up the history of church music from the beginning, with special reference to the liturgy. And the organist should understand that the liturgy represents not merely a form of worship, but is a confession of faith. There is such a thing as catering to the spirit of the times, and, incidentally, losing some of the greatest treasures of the Lutheran Church.

So far as the history of church music in the narrower sense since the Reformation is concerned, the early Church Orders restricted its use, and apparently with the best of reasons. To the liturgists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it was an evidence of the decay of the choral that an organ was absolutely required in services. "To say the truth," says the learned, but eccentric Flacius, "the strange, manifold squeaking (*Quinkelierung*) of the organ does not fit so well into the church as some people seem to think." Instead of finding rules for the introduction of organs, as we should perhaps expect, we find a number of directions which not only correct abuses of the organ as a factor in the liturgical service, but actually restrict its use. According to some Church Orders, the organ was not to be used on Good Friday, or from the second Sunday in Advent till Christmas and from Laetare till Easter. The Pomeranian Agenda also included Rogation Week, with the exception of Ascension Day. It was also not customary for the organ to accompany all the hymns or the entire hymns. In many instances the organ merely intoned the melody and the congregation sang the hymns alone. This was true especially with regard to the German Creed. In addition to these restrictions, the attempts at artistic playing were frowned upon. All efforts which savored of concert playing were not looked upon with favor. Motets or other strange pieces in the service proper were not permitted,

the organ being strictly in the service of the congregation and its singing. The organist might give evidence of his art in the postlude. Emphasis was placed especially on one point, namely, that the preludes, interludes, and postludes, also other voluntaries, should not encroach upon the time reserved for prayers and the sermon. Above all, secular music was strictly taboo, secular songs and fantasies, as well as popular melodies being under the ban. (Cf. Kliefoth, *Die urspruengliche Gottesdienstordnung*, 4, 280. 281.)

These orders were given with good liturgical understanding, not in Puritanical opposition to music as such. One principle must be maintained in the Lutheran Church, namely, that the organ should not occupy an independent position in worship. Its subsidiary character must be expressed at all times. It should serve the congregation above all in the singing of the hymns. The organist will therefore prepare himself very carefully for each service. His music must be selected with the purpose of bringing out the lesson or the character of the day. This will be apparent even in the prelude or voluntary before the beginning of worship. The hymns must be studied both as to text and music to emphasize the spirit in them. All the shadings of joy up to the veriest exultation, all the blendings of sorrow, longing, repentance, and whatever other disposition is brought out in the text, must be correctly interpreted in the music. The preludes for the several chorals especially must agree with the character of the respective hymns. Interludes should not be longer than to afford a breathing-space for the congregation. Above all, extemporaneous playing and improvising is inexcusable at the organ during regular church-services. An artist of the first rank may attempt it at a church concert, but for any one else to test the patience of the congregation in such a manner is little short of an insult. The sacredness of public worship and the exclusive emphasis which we must place upon the means of grace forbid such performances. In many hymns, interludes may be omitted entirely, a long pause being sufficient to indicate the close of a stanza. The organist should avoid chopping two stanzas which form one sentence, or a closely knit paragraph, apart. This is evidence of great thoughtlessness on his part, and seriously interferes with the devotion of the audience. (Fuerbringer, *Leitfaden*, 26.)

A Lutheran organist will remember, above all, that the classical choral melodies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries should always occupy first place in his *repertoire*. He will do well, therefore, to discuss the selection of the melodies with the pastor. To



replace the glorious tunes of the "golden age" in Lutheran church music with some of the shallow, sentimental melodies of modern Gospel-hymns or operas, is little short of sacrilege. The grand old melodies of that age were written for the hymns, or the hymns were written for the melodies, and to divorce them means a lowering of devotional propriety. Only by a consistent combination of forces can the organist serve the edification of the congregation. (Cf. "Lutheran Tunes for Lutheran Congregational Singing," in *Lutheran Witness*, XXXVII, 118.) The words of Kliefoth may well be mentioned here: "The organ deserves special attention in its relation to the singing of church-hymns and the liturgy. That idea, indeed, as though the organ enabled the congregation to learn to sing or sing better, must be dropped. . . . To educate the congregation in the ability to sing the organ is neither needed nor is it adapted for that purpose; but it is good and appropriate for accompanying good church-singing, which is learned by singing and in no other way. And since the organ occupies this accompanying position only, it must be retained in this position. In the service of the congregation only such music has the right of existence as is in the service of the Word. The organ dare not play an independent *role* without such singing. Long preludes, postludes, and interludes must be discontinued, but, above all, the insertion of self-composed fugues and other devices, by which the congregation assembled for services is changed into a concert audience. When the service is over, the organist may exhibit his art and play a fugue or other composition." (*Die urspruengliche Gottesdienstordnung*, 5, 356. 357.) Lochner, in the discussion of this question, calls attention to several points: First, that a long prelude between the reading of the Gospel and the singing of the Creed is out of order, as well as interludes during the Creed; and secondly, that the interludes between the stanzas of the Communion hymn should not be too long. This is more tiresome for the congregation than the singing of several hymns. (*Der Hauptgottesdienst*, 171. 266.)

A question which is broached by Kliefoth, as well as by Lochner, is that of having the organ be silent during the liturgical singing, especially during the chanting of the pastor. The argument which has usually been advanced, that the organ was to *assist* the liturgist, is one which will not hold good, for the liturgist is supposed to know the music of the liturgy thoroughly before attempting to sing it before the altar. The other reason advanced, that the solemnity of the service be enhanced and the devotion be stimulated, has



more to sustain it. The proper playing of the melody not only serves the purpose of impressiveness, but also has a quieting effect upon the mind. Without encouraging mere sentimental rhapsody, it assists in devotional edification. Local circumstances must therefore decide the question as to the accompaniment of chanting by the organ. If the liturgist has a good voice for singing, the organist will do well to accompany the chanting with soft chords. If the pastor's voice is not reliable, he should chant either without accompaniment or, better still, read the passages. The rules given by Kraussold are: "1) The organist should use soft stops only. 2) The recitative chant of the pastor should be norm for the length of the chords. 3) The chanting should never be accompanied *in continuo*, the organ being silent where there is no change in harmony. 4) The pedal must not be used during the recitative chanting of the pastor." (Lochner, *Der Hauptgottesdienst*, 75—79.)

As far as music of the choir is concerned, it must always be in accordance with the purpose of the day. Its proper place is after the Epistle-lesson, instead of the Hallelujah otherwise chanted by the congregation. But choir-singing may also be used during the distribution of Holy Communion. And it must never be forgotten that the choir should be active as choir only, solo singing, unless it be as a movement of a larger composition, being out of place in a Lutheran service, just as much as any other individual and independent activity outside of the means of grace. Everything that reminds of the concert hall must be avoided in a Lutheran service. This includes the placing of the choir in the altar space or on any prominent elevation before the congregation. It is quite proper, however, to place the choir on the balcony of the transept. It must never be forgotten that the Lutheran church choir is a part of the congregation, and represents the congregation in the singing of any hymns of praise. To give to the choir the position of the lower clergy savors of a polity which is not in harmony with Lutheran democracy.

A word may finally be said in regard to selections from operas which are rendered in many churches, the "Bridal March" from *Lohengrin*, the "Intermezzo" from *Cavalleria Rusticana*, and several other melodies being the chief martyrs in this respect. A Lutheran liturgist and a Lutheran organist with tact will immediately feel the impropriety of such music upon the occasion of a church-service. Operatic music for the operatic stage, but church-music for the church! The distinction between religious concert-music and

church-music must be upheld most rigidly if we wish to preserve the glorious heritage of the Church, the matchless choral and the wonderful achievements of Bach and other masters. (Cf. Lochner, 34—38. 84. 85. Dickinson, *Music in the History of the Western Church*, chap. VI.)

P. E. KRETZMANN.

### Literarisches.

**Biblical History for School and Home.** By Dr. M. Reu, Professor at Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa. With Review Questions, Illustrations, and Maps. Translated from the German by Rev. Herman Brueckner, A. M. Wartburg Publishing House, Chicago, Ill. Price, 60 cts.; in quantities with 20% discount and 4% for cash in 30 days.

This Biblical History offers 74 lessons from the Old and 93 from the New Testament, a list of Messianic prophecies, and seven maps. The lessons are divided into numbered paragraphs, and at the end of each story a number of Bible-verses, a reference to the Catechism, a hymn-stanza, and a number of questions are added. The stories are not given with the words of the Bible, the maps are too dark in their shading, and most of the questions too difficult and too long, e. g., No. 13 in 1, No. 10 in 77, and others.

W. C. K.

Im Selbstverlag des Komponisten, Prof. Fr. Reuter, 126 North Washington St., New Ulm, Minn., sind erschienen:

**Christ ist erstanden.** *Christ Is Risen.* Für gemischten Chor. Preis: 15 Cts. Dasselbe für Männer- und dreistimmigen Frauenchor. Preis: Je 15 Cts.

**Du liebliche Ostern.** *O Day of Rejoicing.* Osterkantate für gemischten Chor, Terzett, Kinderchor und Orgel. Preis: 30 Cts.; Porto extra.

Vorliegende Osterchöre erschienen vor einem Jahr so spät, daß sie im „Schulblatt“ erst nach Ostern kurz angezeigt werden konnten. Wir bringen sie deshalb jetzt wieder zur Anzeige.

„Christ ist erstanden“ ist eine Vertonung des Chorals Nr. 98 in unserm Gesangbuch und ist weniger geschulten Chören sehr zu empfehlen.

„Du liebliche Ostern“ ist ein längeres (mit Orgelbegleitung umfaßt es 17 Seiten), aber auch schwierigeres Chorstück. Es gehört unzweifelhaft zu dem Schönsten, was Reuter für gemischte Chöre geliefert hat. Wer seine Weihnachtskantate „Bist nun gekommen“ kennt, findet an diesem lieblichen Osterchor ein ebenbürtiges Seitenstück, dessen Aufführung der Gemeinde einen großen Genuß bereiten wird. Die Komposition besteht aus drei Teilen: 1. Chor, 2. Terzett für Sopran, Alt und Tenor, 3. Chor mit Kinderstimmen. Die Kinder singen die Choralmelodie „Jesus, meine Zuversicht“. Das Terzett, das ganz besonders schön und ansprechend ist, ist auch einzeln zu haben.

Beide Chornummern sind mit deutsch-englischem Text versehen, aber nur die Kantate mit Orgelbegleitung.

R. L.

**Hallelujah! Christ the Lord Is Risen.** By *Martin H. Schumacher*,  
1106 Center St., Jefferson, Wis. Price: Single copy, 15 cts.; dozen,  
\$1.50. For sale by the composer.

This is a composition for a chorus of mixed voices with organ accompaniment. It consists of three movements, none of which is difficult. The music is never trivial and undignified, and, no doubt, choir leaders will gladly render it with their choruses. KL.

### Einführung.

Am 12. Sonnt. n. Trin. wurde Schulanfängerkandidat A. F. Eilers an der Schule der Zionsgemeinde zu Beaver Sp., Mich., eingeführt von  
F. Rutkowski.

### Altes und Neues.

#### Inland.

**U. S. Biblical Research to Outstrip Germans.** — Prediction that with proper financial support American scholarship in Biblical research would outstrip the work of the Germans in that direction was made at a joint meeting of three archaeological societies at Columbia University.

*Northwestern Lutheran.*

**Verkürzung des katholischen Seminarstudiums.** Der Vatikan hat den katholischen Seminaren in Frankreich und England vor zwei Jahren mitgeteilt, daß sie die Verkürzung des theologischen Kurses um zwei Jahre vornehmen sollen. Ein gleicher Befehl erging auch an die katholischen Seminare in den Vereinigten Staaten. Mit andern Worten, die katholische Kirche hält es für zweckmäßig, genau dem Beispiel unserer Regierung in West Point und Annapolis zu folgen. Die Ursache dieser Neuerung ist der Eintritt vieler Priester in den Armeedienst als Kapläne und deren Gehilfen. Ferner liegt die Tatsache vor, daß viele Studierende in den Kriegsdienst eintraten. Freilich ist der Mangel an Priestern hierzulande noch nicht fühlbar wie in Italien, Frankreich und England. In den Vereinigten Staaten gibt es 10,900 katholische Priester. Von diesen gehören wohl 4000 zu dem Orden der Jesuiten, Franziskaner usw. Alle andern sind Diözesan- (oder technisch Säkular-) Priester. Die obengenannte Verkürzungsorder des Studiums betrifft nur die Seminare für Säkularpriester, das heißt, Weltpriester, und nicht diejenigen für Ordenspriester. In Baltimore und St. Louis ist die Zahl der Weltpriester etwas größer als die der Ordenspriester. Philadelphia und Boston haben fast nur Weltpriester, Chicago und New York hingegen haben ein Drittel Ordenspriester und zwei Drittel Weltpriester.  
(Luth. Kirchenzeitung.)

#### Ausland.

**Jüdische Universität in Jerusalem.** Eine New Yorker Zeitung berichtet: „Die kürzlich in Anwesenheit General Allenbys und von Vertretern der französischen und italienischen Truppenverbänden gelegten Grundsteine für die jüdische Universität in Jerusalem sind zwölf an Zahl, je einer für die zwölf Stämme Israels. Das Universitätsgebäude wird auf dem Gipfel des Ölbergs errichtet und hat nach der einen Seite den Ausblick auf Jerusalem, nach der andern überschaut es die Hügel von Moab.“ (Z. u. A.)